

1990s. We owe them more for making this country successful and prosperous. We owe them a strong secure safety net when they lose their jobs through no fault of their own. Thirteen additional weeks of unemployment benefits is only a small tribute to the strength and perseverance of the American worker, and I am disappointed that this Congress has once again denied them the respect they deserve.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today in support of legislation to extend Federal emergency unemployment benefits to the millions of Americans who have exhausted their regular benefits.

I strongly believe that, given the state of the economy, Congress has an obligation to extend the Federal Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation, TEUC, program before we leave for the Memorial Day recess. This is especially urgent when considering the U.S. Department of Labor has estimated that by the end of 2003 more than 2.1 million workers will have exhausted their State unemployment compensation benefits without finding work. In my State of Maine, almost 11,000 unemployed Maine workers are projected to exhaust their State and Federal unemployment benefits in the next 6 months and more than one-quarter of these workers, 26 percent, will have exhausted all benefits available under the extension and still be unable to find work.

The bill before us today is similar to Senator MURKOWSKI's legislation, S. 1079, of which I am a cosponsor, and is an extension of the current Federal TEUC program due to expire at the end of May. H.R. 2185 will extend TEUC for an additional 7 months, to December 31, 2003, and will provide benefits to an estimated 2.1 million Americans.

But we must think of these many millions of unemployed Americans as more than just numbers. In Maine, they live in towns like Millinocket, Old Town, and Sanford, where large, established employers have either closed their doors or downsized, and in the process forced longtime workers onto the unemployment rolls. If the program is not extended, according to the Maine Department of Labor, 6,000 Maine workers will exhaust their State unemployment benefits without ever receiving any Federal benefits. Extending temporary Federal benefits is particularly important for hard-hit mill towns like Millinocket, where every store and every landlord has been affected by the layoffs. The TEUC program can get help to those individuals and those communities that need it most.

In closing, Mr. President, I believe that it is critical for Congress to continue to provide the temporary support to families who have been hurt by the economic downturn, and give these families access to the resources they need to stay afloat until they can find new, gainful employment. As such, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Sen-

ate version of H.R. 2185, and urge my colleagues to join me in support of this effort.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS OF 2003

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of H.R. 2185 to extend the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002; providing further that the bill be read the third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I object.

Let me get it straight. Do we have the yeas and nays?

Mr. REID. We will take care of you. Let's get this done.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. REID. If I might, I appreciate very much the consideration of the Senator from South Carolina because we have not finished his amendment. We failed to tell him that the Senator from Alaska was going to offer this request.

This is, as I understand it, the House passed unemployment insurance compensation action; is that true?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. That is correct.

Mr. REID. We have no objection.

We are very grateful this is completed. As we indicated earlier, we are sorry it is not an extended benefit but we are better off than we were an hour and a half or 2 hours ago. We extend our appreciation to the majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 2185) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### INCREASING THE STATUTORY LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT— Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 836

Mr. HOLLINGS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REID. I say to the Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Iowa will speak for a very brief period of time and then he is going to, I understand, move to table your amendment.

I wonder, is the Senator going to yield back his time?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I am happy to yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will yield back my time.

I move to table the amendment and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

Mr. GRASSLEY. The Hollings amendment would prevent the "disinvestment" of the Social Security Trust Fund. What that means is if we did not increase the debt limit, the Social Security Trust Fund could not be used to pay Social Security benefits. We need to defeat this amendment and pass a clean debt limit bill so Social Security checks can go out on time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 836.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 201 Leg.]

#### YEAS—52

Alexander	Dole	Miller
Allard	Domenici	Murkowski
Allen	Ensign	Nickles
Bennett	Enzi	Roberts
Bond	Fitzgerald	Santorum
Brownback	Frist	Sessions
Bunning	Graham (SC)	Shelby
Burns	Grassley	Smith
Campbell	Gregg	Snowe
Chafee	Hagel	Specter
Chambliss	Hatch	Stevens
Cochran	Hutchison	Sununu
Coleman	Inhofe	Talent
Collins	Kyl	Thomas
Cornyn	Lott	Voinovich
Craig	Lugar	Warner
Crapo	McCain	
DeWine	McConnell	

#### NAYS—46

Akaka	Dorgan	Lieberman
Baucus	Durbin	Lincoln
Bayh	Feingold	Mikulski
Biden	Feinstein	Murray
Bingaman	Graham (FL)	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Breaux	Hollings	Pryor
Byrd	Inouye	Reed
Cantwell	Jeffords	Reid
Carper	Johnson	Rockefeller
Clinton	Kerry	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kohl	Schumer
Corzine	Landrieu	Stabenow
Daschle	Lautenberg	Wyden
Dayton	Leahy	
Dodd	Levin	

#### NOT VOTING—2

Edwards Kennedy

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. REID. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

SENATOR PETE V. DOMENICI'S TWELVE-THOUSANDTH VOTE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the Senate. On the last rollcall vote, No. 201, the one we just completed, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, current chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and the former long-serving chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator PETE V. DOMENICI, cast his twelve-thousandth vote in this Chamber—12,000 votes.

(Applause, Senators Rising.)

Senator DOMENICI now joins a very historic and select club of Senators who can claim this distinction. Senators now cast more votes in each Congress than they did in the past. So while historical records are not perfect, our Senate Librarian says we are safe to conclude that among all Senators who have served since the beginning of the Republic, Senator DOMENICI is in a class of only ten.

Since the beginning of the Republic, only Nine other U.S. Senators have similarly cast more than 12,000 votes in their careers in the Senate. Five of them are serving today. The Club of Nine now becomes the Club of Ten with Senator DOMENICI's last vote today.

The Club of Nine has been: Senator Claiborne Pell; Senator William Roth; Senator William Proxmire; the current President pro tempore, Senator TED STEVENS; Senator EDWARD KENNEDY; Senator DANIEL INOUE; Senator ERNEST HOLLINGS, Senator Strom Thurmond; and—with over 16,685 votes—the all-time record, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD.

Senator DOMENICI, I know I speak for all of your colleagues, all of your fellow Senators, when I say: Congratulations on this achievement. But, more importantly, thank you for your tremendous service over the years to New Mexico, to your country, and, most importantly, to the U.S. Senate.

Mr. DOMENICI. Thank you.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

I thank you very much. I know people are ready to catch airplanes, and we are on a time schedule, and I should say only a couple of words, if any. So I will say that sometimes it seems as if I am just starting. Sometimes late at night, it seems as if I have been here forever. I don't know how my wife, who is watching, is taking this. It may be that she might be thinking it is going to come to an end soon and perhaps we will not be here any longer. I hope not.

But let me say to all of you: Thank you for your kind words. But, most of all, thanks to the Senate. It did not take 12,000 votes to learn how to be a Senator but it took some time. Once you get there, you know you are. Once you are a Senator, there is just nothing like it. Once you know what the Senate is, you know there is nothing like it. I have been given enough time for both.

I believe I know how to be a Senator, and I believe I know what the Senate is. Both have been heralded and written about. Whatever it is that has been said is all true. It is a rather fantastic place. You cannot serve with a greater group of people. There is no conceivable way that I, as an American, could spend time with 100 men and women of the caliber that we have here, whatever that is in terms of their variety of skills, measures, and attributes; and that is for sure.

With that, and for that, I thank all of you. In particular today, for doing this, I thank our distinguished majority leader.

Thank you very much.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in the interest of time—I want to turn to the Democratic leader for his comment—but I have asked all of our colleagues to withhold further comments on this celebration, to submit them for the RECORD or to give them after we complete the voting today. We are trying to keep the bill moving.

Again, I want the Democratic leader to comment but then I do ask our colleagues to wait to speak on this celebration. They will have an opportunity to do so later.

Mr. REID. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. FRIST. Yes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all Senators wishing to make statements regarding Senator DOMENICI be allowed to do so, and at such time as they are completed, that they be put in a proper cover and given to Senator DOMENICI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I add my heartfelt congratulations, as well, as we celebrate this special moment in the distinguished career of our friend and colleague, Senator DOMENICI.

It was Teddy Roosevelt who once said: Life has no blessing like that of the ability to work hard at work worth doing. No one knows that better than Senator DOMENICI. He has worked hard at work worth doing now for all of these years.

I remember I was a young staff person in 1973, and he was a newly elected Senator from New Mexico, formerly the mayor of Albuquerque. Even back then many of us recognized—because of his intelligence, his good will, and the way he was able to demonstrate his ability to work across the aisle—that we would have the good fortune to work with him for a long, long time.

He has now cast more votes than 1,877 of our colleagues, including most of us on the Senate floor.

As we mark this occasion—knowing he has many more years to go, knowing he has many more thresholds to break—we congratulate him, we wish him good fortune, and we recognize this extraordinary achievement today.

I yield the floor and, again, congratulate him heartily.

Mr. DOMENICI. Thank you very much.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we have three Senators who are seeking recognition to offer amendments. Senator DORGAN has an amendment that will take 10 minutes; Senator HARKIN, 10 minutes; and Senator DURBIN, 5 minutes. They will all ask for a voice vote on their amendments. Following that, we will be ready to go to final passage.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, could I ask unanimous consent those be the only amendments in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me also congratulate my colleague from New Mexico: A hearty congratulations to you.

AMENDMENT NO. 837

Mr. President, I know airplanes are waiting and jet engines are idling, and there are some Members wishing to leave this Chamber quickly.

Let me, in a matter of a couple minutes, say a word about the national debt and then about the trade debt.

We worry a lot about the national debt, as a result of budget policy in the Congress. So we actually come to the Congress, and we come to the floor of the Senate, and we vote on putting a limit on Federal debt. We have a debt limit. However, there is another debt, and there is no limit on that debt. I am referring to the foreign debt—the debt that results from trade deficits.

We have a Federal budget deficit this year that is expected to be somewhere around \$317 billion. That is the current estimate. But if last year's figures are any guide, our trade deficit this year will be much higher than the federal budget deficit, well over \$435 billion. And that trade deficit means an increase on our foreign debt.

There is no limit on the foreign debt. Whatever it is, it is. Wherever it goes, it goes. That is just the way we, apparently, have decided to live with it as country, for as long as we can get away with it.

Well, in my judgment, we ought to have some basic limitation with respect to trade debt, or at least some mechanism that triggers actions if the trade debt exceeds a certain level.

My amendment, which I have at the desk, would say that when U.S. foreign debt exceeds 25 percent of GDP, or the trade deficit exceeds 5 percent of the GDP, it triggers the following: USTR will be required to, within 15 days of such a breach, convene an emergency meeting of the Trade Policy Review Group, and within 45 days present to Congress, from that group, a report detailing the Trade Policy Review Group's trade deficit reduction plan.

My feeling is we ought to have some basic limitation on what we are doing with respect to international trade. I do not suggest we put borders around this country or we, in any way, inhibit trade. But trade needs to be fair trade—and it is not.

As shown on this chart, this is what has been happening to our trade deficit. The ink is all red and it is escalating at a very serious rate.

Let me use one example to show the absurdity of what is happening in international trade. It involves the country of South Korea.

I just picked this but I could pick China, Europe, Japan, Canada, Mexico. I just happen to pick South Korea.

In 2001, Korea shipped 618,000 vehicles into our country—Hyundais, Daewoos, etc.—all around our country. Do you know how many cars we were able to ship to South Korea? We shipped 2,800 American cars to South Korea.

Why is that the case? South Korea does not want our cars sold in that country. They put up every kind of imaginative trade barrier you can think of.

We just had an example in the first part of this year with the Dodge Dakota pickup. Daimler-Chrysler started to sell the Dodge Dakota pickup in Korea. They were actually fairly successful. They had 60 orders in February and they had 60 orders in March. They don't make a pickup that is equivalent to the Dodge Dakota in South Korea. So at an annualized rate, that would have been almost a 50-percent increase in U.S. car imports alone in that country just with the Dodge Dakota pickup.

Guess what happened.

In March, an official from the Ministry of Construction and Transportation decided: Enough of those Dodge Dakotas. He said people were going to put optional cargo covers on them and that might make them dangerous if passengers rode in the back. He announced that cargo covers on pickups and Dodge Dakotas are illegal. South Korean newspapers had big headlines: "Government Ministry Finds Dodge Dakota Covers Illegal."

Guess what happened. Immediately, Korean customers cancelled their orders for Dodge Dakotas. And all of a sudden, we were not selling Dodge Dakota pickup trucks in Korea anymore. So here we are, 618,000 cars headed to the United States, and we only get to sell 2,800 in Korea.

I could talk about China and wheat, Europe and beef, Canada and durum. I could talk about Mexico. I don't have the time today because several of you want to leave. I respect that. But I do want to at least offer this amendment. I will accept a voice vote.

I will come back with this amendment because this country ought to have the spine to stand up for fairness in trade. One of the reasons we are hemorrhaging in red ink is that trade circumstances with our major trading partners are simply not fair to American producers and to American workers. We need to change this.

We can attempt to ignore this forever, but we do it at our peril. You can make a case that budget deficits we owe to ourselves, and we will repay ourselves. You cannot make a similar case with the trade deficit. We inevitably will repay a trade deficit with a lower standard of living in the United States. This country should be about the business of having fair trade, requiring fair trade, and requiring enforcement of existing trade agreements.

I have a lot more to say. I will say it at some future time.

I ask that the amendment be called up. It is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] proposes an amendment numbered 837.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To impose limits on United States foreign debt)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. . . FOREIGN DEBT CEILING.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States has become the world's largest net debtor Nation, having run up massive trade deficits in the 1990s.

(2) At the end of 2001, the net United States foreign debt stood at over \$2,300,000,000,000.

(3) The United States foreign debt position worsened in 2002, when the United States had a record trade deficit of over \$436,000,000,000, equivalent to 4.1 percent of the United States GDP that year.

(4) The large and growing United States foreign debt represents claims on United States assets by foreign nationals, which will eventually have to be repaid. If unchecked, the foreign debt could seriously undermine our children's future standard of living.

(5) Moreover, the growing accumulation of foreign claims on United States assets, including nearly \$1,200,000,000,000 in United States Treasury securities, makes the United States economy vulnerable to the whims of foreign investors.

(6) Congress presently places a ceiling on United States public debt, but does not place a ceiling on United States foreign debt.

(7) Just as Congress recognized the importance of placing a ceiling on the United States public debt, it is appropriate that Congress place a limit on the United States foreign debt.

**(b) ACTIONS TRIGGERED BY UNITED STATES FOREIGN DEBT.—**

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the 15th day of the second month after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 3 months thereafter, the United States Trade Representative shall determine if—

(A) the net United States foreign debt for the preceding 12-month period is more than 25 percent of United States GDP for the same period; or

(B) the United States trade deficit for the preceding 12-month period is more than 5 percent of United States GDP for the same period.

(2) ACTION BY USTR.—Whenever an affirmative determination is made under paragraph (1) (A) or (B), the United States Trade Representative shall—

(A) within 15 days of the determination, convene an emergency meeting of the Trade Policy Review Group to develop a plan of action to reduce the United States trade deficit; and

(B) within 45 days of the determination, present to Congress a report detailing the Trade Policy Review Group's trade deficit reduction plan.

**(c) MEASUREMENT OF FOREIGN DEBT.—**

(1) STATISTICAL SOURCES.—For purposes of the calculations described in subsection (b)(1), the United States Trade Representative shall rely on the most recent period for which the following data, published by the Department of Commerce, is available:

(A) In the case of United States foreign debt, the United States Trade Representa-

tive shall use the net international investment position of the United States, with direct investment positions determined at market value, as compiled by the Bureau of Economic Analysis.

(B) In the case of the United States trade deficit, the United States Trade Representative shall use the goods and services trade deficit data compiled by the United States Census Bureau.

(C) In the case of the United States GDP, the United States Trade Representative shall use the nominal gross domestic product data compiled by the Bureau of Economic Analysis.

(2) ADJUSTMENT.—The United States Trade Representative may adjust the data described in paragraph (1) to ensure that the determination is made for comparable time periods.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does any Senator wish to speak to the amendment? The distinguished Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to speak in opposition to the amendment. I think the information the Senator from North Dakota wants, and wants in one document or one report, is a very legitimate bit of information, not just a small bit but a legitimate amount of information that he wants, and it is a reasonable request. I think a lot of it exists in the Department of Commerce and maybe it is just a case of bringing it all together. But that can't be the issue today. The issue today is, if we amend this bill, it goes back to the House, and then we are in a situation where we are not able to operate Government. We can't wait until the month of June to get a conference with the House on this issue. The Secretary of Treasury has made it very clear that he has taken all prudent and legal steps available to him to avoid reaching the statutory debt limit.

I urge everybody to vote against the amendment regardless of the merits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I will take a voice vote and say, this amendment will be visiting the floor of the Senate again soon on another matter. I appreciate the comments from the Senator from Iowa. I believe this is an important issue. I hope my colleagues will support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 837.

The amendment (No. 837) was rejected.

**AMENDMENT NO. 838**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The other distinguished Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the debt resolution that we have before us raises the debt limit by \$984 billion—a record, the biggest ever in the history of the United States. What does that mean for the average American family? It means we are adding the equivalent of \$3,500 to the credit card of every man, woman, and child in America. For a family of four, you just got \$14,000 added to your family's debt. These are

new charges. That is just what we are about to vote on here. This is the new debt on top of the old debt. Now that is the debt.

How about the interest charges? Under the President's budget, we will see interest on the debt rise from an estimated \$240 billion this year to \$514 billion in 10 years under the assumptions of the budget pushed through by the majority that closely followed the President's plan in many respects. That is \$1,800 a year for every person in the country. That is just on the interest, \$7,200 a year for a family of four in 2013 and higher sums thereafter. The ranking member of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Montana, said it right: We are imposing, No. 1, a debt tax on our children and grandchildren. But we are also imposing an interest debt tax on our families.

We just went through this whole thing about this tax bill that skews everything to the wealthy. We all know that. Yet what about our families? I am sure they will say: We got some good things for families. We got a little marriage penalty thing there; we have a child credit, all that. But in 10 years, the interest just on the debt we are voting on today will be \$7,200 a year for a family of four, right out of their taxes, \$7,200 a year. Tell me about how much we have helped our families with this crazy tax bill we just passed this morning?

And right now, I think the vote we are about to take on this debt bill says it all. Tax cuts for those at the top, a few little things for working families, but we are going to gouge the working families of this country by making them pay the interest on the national debt—\$7,200 a year for a family of four, just on the interest.

More and more every year we go down the pike, more and more of the taxes that our hard-working Americans pay will go for what? To pay the interest on the national debt. Will we get any more education? No. Will we pay our teachers better? No. Will we invest more in medical research? No. Will we have better prescription drugs for the elderly? No. We won't do all those things because it is going to go to pay the interest on the national debt. That is what we are about to vote on right here.

Just the other day I went over to the Cannon House Office Building. They had a big demonstration there of fuel cells, renewable energy. That is what we ought to be investing in. That is what the Government should be investing in to make us energy independent. Guess what. We won't put the resources into that important need like we should. We will dribble a little bit here and there, but we won't do it right. Why? Because we are paying interest on the national debt. And why are we raising the debt? Because we have this big tax cut. Why do we have this big tax cut? It does please the wealthy contributors of the Republican Party. That is a part of it.

Now we are going to vote to increase the national debt, put it on the backs of every man, woman, and child in the Nation.

Well, there is one other thing. Because of this exploding debt and the interest on the debt that we will have to pay, it is a threat to the solvency of Social Security and Medicare. The President's tax plan is larger, if made permanent, then the entire 75 year estimated shortfall in both Social Security and Medicare. Later this year, the President says he wants us to work a prescription drug benefit for the elderly for \$400 billion. He is going to squeeze everybody into HMOs type organizations. Why? Because we don't have enough money to pay for a good plan because it is going to pay the interest on the national debt so we can cover outrageous giveaways to the very wealthy.

I might talk about Medicare fairness. We voted this week on an amendment offered by my colleague from Iowa to take care of some Medicare fairness. Eighty-six Senators voted for it. It was not in the President's plan. The President said, no, we can't do that now. It is squeezing everything out.

I want to talk about the specifics of my amendment, to provide for a true cost of tax bills requirement. The official score or estimate of what the tax bill is supposed to cost is \$350 billion. But, that is not what really occurred. Don't take my word for it, take the word of the Speaker of the House. This was in Congress Daily today:

Although the \$350 billion tax cut bill moving toward President Bush's desk is half of the original request, House Speaker HASTERT told Congress Daily Thursday that the final package incorporates key features of the House plan. "The 350 billion number takes us through the next 2 years basically," HASTERT said. "But also it could end up being a trillion-dollar bill because this stuff is extendable. That is a fight we are going to have to have, and it is not a bad fight to have."

There you go. It is not \$350 billion. It is closer to \$1 trillion. The editorial in the Washington Post this morning said the same thing.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, if we keep these tax breaks going, the total cost will be a minimum of \$815 billion. And now, after all of that, what are we asked to do? Go to the well and vote for the largest increase in the national debt ever held paying for this tax break for the wealthy.

My amendment is very simple. I call it the "telling the true cost of the tax bill" requirement. The premise is that Congress and the American people should know the real cost of major tax provisions—not the Enron kind of budgeting we have had for this tax bill.

My amendment would require the Joint Tax Committee to reveal the true 10-year cost of provisions in the tax bill that cost over \$1 billion a year when fully in effect. In other words, to show the full cost, the Joint Tax Committee would provide true costs regardless of the variety of gimmicks we have

seen used in the 2001 tax bill, as well as the tax bill being passed this morning.

If a provision sunsets early, the cost will be provided as if it is in place for the full 10-year period. That is what this amendment does. I have the amendment here. I will send it to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] proposes an amendment numbered 838.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: Requiring estimates of certain decreases in Federal revenues for periods after the decrease is sunset)

At the appropriate place, insert:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ TELLING THE TRUTH ABOUT THE LONG-TERM COST OF TAX CHANGES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the Joint Committee on Taxation prepares an estimate of any applicable proposed change in Federal revenue law, the committee shall include with such estimate an estimate of the decrease in Federal revenues which—

(1) in the case of an applicable proposed change described in subsection (b)(1), would have occurred without regard to the reduction or termination described in such subsection during the portion of the period covered by the estimate after the reduction or termination, and

(2) in the case of an applicable proposed change described in subsection (b)(2), will occur during the 10-fiscal year period beginning with the fiscal year following the first fiscal year in which the proposed change becomes fully effective.

(b) APPLICABLE PROPOSED CHANGE.—For purposes of this section, the term "applicable proposed change" means any of the following proposed changes in Federal revenue law:

(1) SUNSET OR REDUCED CHANGES.—Any proposed change which—

(A) when fully effective will have an estimated decrease in Federal revenues of more than \$1,000,000,000 in each fiscal year, and

(B) provides for the termination of such change, or a reduction in such revenue decrease, on or before the close of the period covered by the estimate which the Joint Committee on Taxation is otherwise preparing for such proposed change.

(2) DELAY IN FULL EFFECT.—Any proposed change which—

(A) becomes fully effective at any time during the last 4 years of the period covered by the estimate which the Joint Committee on Taxation is otherwise preparing for such proposed change, and

(B) when fully effective will have an estimated decrease in Federal revenues of more than \$1,000,000,000 in each fiscal year.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, as well intentioned as the amendment is to bring information to the Congress from the Joint Committee on Taxation, to bring a greater degree of transparency to where we are on certain tax legislation, I have to ask my colleagues to vote against this amendment because if it were adopted, it would force the bill back to the House

and we would not be able to fund Government. We would also have a situation of having to have a conference. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does any other Senator wish to speak on the amendment?

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, look, one more time. The reason we cannot have amendments to this bill is because the House has gone home? We are going to have the biggest increase in the national debt this country has ever seen and the House went home? That is why we cannot amend it?

Please explain that to my constituents in Iowa, or anywhere in the country, that somehow it makes sense that we cannot amend it because the House went home and we are going to have the biggest increase in debt in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 838) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 839

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] proposes an amendment numbered 839.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require a CBO report on any new debt created by a budget resolution upon the reporting of that budget resolution)

At the end of the resolution, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ CBO REPORT ON DEBT IMPACT OF BUDGET RESOLUTION.**

Section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) CBO DEBT IMPACT REPORT.—Each budget resolution reported out by the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate shall be accompanied by a report from CBO containing CBO’s best estimate of the following:

“(1) The amount of new debt subject to limit, in aggregate and divided by the most recent estimate of the United States population, according to the Bureau of the Census, that would be created if the budget resolution is adhered to, assuming reserve funds are spent and reconciliation instructions are fully complied with.

“(2) The amount of new debt subject to limit, if any, in aggregate and divided by the most recent estimate of the United States population, according to the Bureau of the Census, that would have been created if the budget resolution simply reflected the CBO baseline without policy changes.

“(3) The difference between paragraphs (1) and (2).

“(4) Of the amount determined in paragraph (3)—

“(A) the amount of new debt subject to limit, in aggregate and divided by the most recent estimate of the United States population, according to the Bureau of the Census, that is attributable to tax changes; and

“(B) the amount of new debt subject to limit, in aggregate and divided by the most recent estimate of the United States population, according to the Bureau of the Census, that is attributable to policy changes other than tax changes.”.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, the once proud Senate is no longer a voice, it is an echo—an echo of a by-gone era when giants in the Senate strode the halls of this great institution. But not today. On amendment after amendment after amendment, we are told that the Senate is voiceless, the Senate is powerless, the House has left and there is nothing we can do. We have turned into a unicameral legislature before your eyes.

Now a majority of the Senators parade in the halls of this great institution with signs that read “me, too,” signs that read “the House of Representatives knows best,” signs that read “the Senate no longer has time to think or to act. We just do what the House tells us to do.”

No matter how good the suggestion or amendment on the floor of the Senate today, it has been summarily rejected by the majority. Efforts to protect Social Security, rejected; efforts for accountability in budgeting, rejected; efforts for accountability of this White House and future Presidents, rejected. Why? Because the House told us to take it or leave it.

Well, I have hope for the Senate and the Members. I give you an amendment now that you can embrace to show you still believe in the Senate as it once reigned on Capitol Hill, embrace because you understand that on its face it is so logical, straightforward, so easy that you can embrace this amendment with the full knowledge that when you vote on final passage and go home, at least once today you stood up for the dignity of this great institution; at least once today, you thought for yourself; at least once today, common sense prevailed.

What does this amendment do? It simply calls for accountability. Once each year, the CBO will tell us what our actions have done to add to the national debt. It will tell us whether tax increases are going to create more debt for our children. It will publish that number and put it into terms so every single American will know whether we have increased the mortgage on America for our children and grandchildren to carry. That is it. It is so simple, straightforward.

My friend from Iowa, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, from that commonsense bastion in the Midwest, that great State of Iowa, I know he believes in accountability, he believes in standing up for a report card on Congress, and that he will stand with me shoulder to shoulder, bipartisan, proud to tell the American people what we have done, proud to admit

to the American people if we have added to their debt. I know he will be with me on this and he will break the shackles of the House of Representatives, and we will finally come together in a bipartisan fashion for the future of the Senate. I will applaud him for standing in support of the amendment.

I am only going to ask for a voice vote because I know it is going to be unanimous.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does any other Senator wish to speak to the Senator’s embracing amendment?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to speak the common sense of Iowa to the Senator from the political machine of Chicago and to express a simple statement of fact: If, in fact, we had adopted the minority’s budget, the Democrat budget, earlier this year, we would be facing the exact same increase in the debt ceiling now and by almost the same exact amount of money throughout the rest of the year. So it doesn’t matter whether you are in the majority or we are, we would be doing about the same thing right now. So don’t try to fool the people of America. You cannot do it even if you are from Chicago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Any other Senators wishing to be heard? The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Chicago can handle itself, whether we are playing Iowa in sports or in politics, but I ask my friend from Iowa, if you believe the deficits don’t count, stand tall, stand proud, and admit that to the American people. Just go ahead and tell them once a year whether you have added to the national debt by the actions in Congress. It is that simple. It is a report card on what we do. I am sure the Senator from Iowa is in favor and doesn’t want to leave any taxpayer behind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 839) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 51) was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, once again, I thank the chairman of the Finance Committee for his hard work yesterday and today. In addition, I thank all Members for their patience and cooperation throughout this legislative period, a very productive few weeks of session. We have had busy days and long nights. It was worth the effort.

The next vote will be the last vote prior to the Memorial Day recess. The Senate will reconvene on Monday, June 2. However, no rollcall votes will occur that day. Members can expect the next

rollcall vote on Tuesday at approximately 12 noon. That vote most likely will be in relation to an amendment to the energy bill.

I wish everyone a safe recess, and I look forward to working with everybody following this recess.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would vote "nay".

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 202 Leg.]

#### YEAS—53

Alexander	DeWine	McConnell
Allard	Dole	Miller
Allen	Domenici	Murkowski
Bennett	Enzi	Nickles
Bond	Fitzgerald	Roberts
Breaux	Frist	Santorum
Brownback	Graham (SC)	Sessions
Bunning	Grassley	Shelby
Burns	Gregg	Smith
Campbell	Hagel	Snowe
Chafee	Hatch	Specter
Chambliss	Hutchison	Stevens
Cochran	Inhofe	Sununu
Coleman	Jeffords	Talent
Collins	Kyl	Thomas
Cornyn	Lott	Voinovich
Craig	Lugar	Warner
Crapo	McCaIn	

#### NAYS—44

Akaka	Dorgan	Lieberman
Baucus	Durbin	Lincoln
Bayh	Ensign	Mikulski
Biden	Feingold	Murray
Bingaman	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Graham (FL)	Nelson (NE)
Byrd	Harkin	Pryor
Cantwell	Hollings	Reed (RI)
Carper	Inouye	Reid (NV)
Clinton	Johnson	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kohl	Sarbanes
Corzine	Landrieu	Schumer
Daschle	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Dayton	Leahy	Wyden
Dodd	Levin	

#### NOT VOTING—3

Edwards	Kennedy	Kerry
---------	---------	-------

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 51) was passed.

Mr. FRIST. I move to reconsider that vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent when the Senate receives from the House the companion to S. 1050, the Defense authorization bill, the Senate proceed to its consideration at a time

determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Democratic leader; provided further that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 1050 as passed be inserted in lieu thereof; and further, any other amendments in order be: Warner, two amendments regarding BRAC; Dorgan-Lott, BRAC amendment, 30 minutes equally divided, no second degrees; Kennedy-Cornyn-Brownback-McCain, immigration, 30 minutes, equally divided; Reid-Inhofe, concurrent receipts; that the amendments be subject to relevant second degrees under the same debate limitation except where noted.

I further ask consent that following the disposition of the above mentioned amendments, the bill be read the third time and the Senate then proceed to a vote on passage of the House measure, as amended; finally, I ask that the Senate then insist on its amendment, requesting a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from West Virginia requested 20 minutes and I ask the unanimous consent request be modified to accommodate Senator BYRD's request.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I will ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Hampshire have 5 minutes, followed by Senator BYRD for 20 minutes, followed by Senators BOND and TALENT for 10 minutes, and prior to the Senator from New Hampshire, 30 seconds to Senator SPECTER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES FROM COLA CUTS

Mr. SPECTER. I ask unanimous consent that the Daschle amendment numbered 834 be modified to be placed in the form of a Senate resolution; that the resolution, be adopted the preamble be adopted, with a motion to reconsider being laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, this resolution provides that Social Security cost-of-living adjustments shall be maintained.

I thank the Chair. I thank my colleagues. I thank the Democratic leader.

The resolution (S. Res. 155) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

#### S. RES. 155

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that:

(1) Social Security provides a relatively modest insurance benefit for seniors—many of whom rely on Social Security for part or all of their monthly income. Without Social Security, forty-eight percent of beneficiaries would be in poverty today.

(2) In order to protect benefit levels against inflation, Social Security beneficiaries receive an annual cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) based on Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers (CPI-W).

(3) The January 2003 COLA provided only a 1.4 percent increase in Social Security benefits, increasing the average monthly benefit for all retired workers by only \$13 (from \$882 to \$895).

(4) Annual growth in Medicare premiums and out-of-pocket health care costs for retired individuals on fixed incomes far exceeded the small COLA increases provided to Social Security beneficiaries.

(5) Reducing COLAs will disproportionately harm low-income Social Security beneficiaries and push millions of seniors into poverty.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that Social Security cost-of-living adjustments should not be reduced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

#### MEDICARE VISION REHABILITATION SERVICES ACT OF 2003

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. President, today I rise to ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the Medicare Vision Rehabilitation Services Act of 2003. This is legislation I introduced in the Senate this past week to deal with vision impairment, one of the most common disabilities affecting seniors today.

Millions of Americans currently have impaired vision. The number of people in the United States with vision impairments continues to increase. The vision impairment is a loss of vision that is not correctable by standard glasses, contact lenses, medicine or surgery. One of the leading causes of vision impairment and blindness in the United States is age-related disease and that is why it is important we begin to deal with this serious illness under our Medicare system.

Vision rehabilitation assists individuals with this serious vision loss so they can safely navigate in their own homes and within their local environments. Vision rehabilitation services help people avoid medication errors, help them cook and use kitchen utensils safely, and help avoid burns and falls; in short, help them to be more independent in their own community and enable them to enjoy a better quality of life.

Importantly, vision rehabilitation services promote safety and that all-important independence for our elderly. This legislation would ensure that Medicare coverage for vision rehab